



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/039,981	12/31/2001	Jeff Mason	073449-235-NP	8740

7590 06/29/2005

MICHAEL R. FRISCIA
WOLFF & SAMSON, PC
ONE BOLAND DRIVE
THE OFFICES AT CRYSTA L LAKE
WEST ORANGE, NJ 07052

EXAMINER

HOANG, PHUONG N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2194

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/039,981

Applicant(s)

MASON ET AL.

Examiner

Phuong N. Hoang

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 2 are pending for examination.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code [page 4 lines 13 or paragraph 0012]. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1 – 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor, US patent no. 6,256,676 in view of Vijaykumar, US patent no. 5,745,896.**
5. Taylor and Vijaykumar references were cited in the last office action.

6. **As to claim 1**, Taylor teaches a system for synchronizing data between applications (applications, col. 10 lines 40 – 60) having respective applicant data stores (application resources, col. 13 lines 1 – 5 and fig. 2), the system comprising the steps of:

two or more application service adapters (a plurality of adapters, each of which respectively one of the plurality of enterprise applications, abstract and col. 11 lines 40 – 50 and fig. 2) associated with the application data stores;

an integration engine (engine, col. 11 lines 40 – 50) having associated therewith an integration engine service adapter (ADK 130, col. 11 lines 40 – 65) and an integration engine data store (database storage, col. 8 lines 5 – 20) the integration engine manages the flow of information among all the data stores (pass messages between the computer applications which are associated with applicant resources, col. 8 lines 5 – 20 col. 10 lines 40 – 50 and col. 12 lines 25 – 30). Taylor teaches RDBMS comprising many databases (col. 11 lines 30 – 40 and fig. 2).

However, Taylor does not explicitly teach a links table for managing shared integration data.

Vigaykumar teaches RDBMS which has a link table for managing shared intergration data (table containing link relationship, col. 14 lines 11 – 52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Taylor and Vigaykumar's system

because Vigaykumar's linking table would be necessary for the RDBMS to maintain the referential integrity of the update or delete rules and enhance the third normalization.

7. **As to claim 2**, it is the method claim of claim 1. See rejection for claim 1 above.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 4/18/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

9. Applicants argued in substance that

(1). Vijaykumar fails to cure deficiencies of Taylor, and it is different from the applicant's invention as defined in amended claims providing a stand-alone applications, and concept of a global unique ID.

10. Examiner respectfully disagreed with applicant's remark

As to point 1, Applicant fails to point out how Vijaykumar fails to cure deficiencies of Taylor. Taylor teaches a RDBMS system that requires the link tables, and Vijaykumar teaches RDBMS comprising link tables. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Taylor and Vijaykumar's system because Vijaykumar's link tables would enable the

RDBMS to maintain the referential integrity of the update or delete rules and enhance the third normalization. Applicant does not see anywhere in the either original or amended claims claimed stand-alone applications, and concept of a global unique ID.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Phuong N. Hoang** whose telephone number is (571)272-3763. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 am to 5:30 pm.

Art Unit: 2194

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571)272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ph
June 24, 2005



ST. JOHN COURTENAY III
PRIMARY EXAMINER